



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS, XLIII, 1.

I.

Pp. 1-31. The Aeolisms of Homer, by Karl Sittl. Until a recent date the language of Homer was regarded as a mixture of different dialects. Some held that in Homeric times the Greek language had not yet split up into dialects, while others believed that Homer had, on his rhapsodic tours, appropriated the peculiarities of various tribes. Zenodotus applied the latter hypothesis to the criticism of the text, and Trypho developed it at length in his large work *Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ διαλέκτων καὶ Πινδάρῳ καὶ Ἀλκμαῖνι < καὶ Στρησιχόρῳ καὶ Ἰβύκῳ > καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις λυρικοῖς*. It was probably from this work that the scholiasts and Herodian drew their remarks on the Homeric dialect. To Trypho was due also the fact that, when a word occurs, for instance, only in Homer and Ibycus, the ancients did not assume that Ibycus took it from Homer, but that Homer used a Rheginian word. These hypotheses, of course, have been replaced by sounder views; but the "Aeolisms" still remain, though they are ascribed to a different cause. The ancients, for the most part, believed the language of Homer to be a mixture of Ionic and Aeolic. This resulted from the assumption that the Homeric archaisms, which in later times were found only among the Aeolians, must be Aeolisms. This name was extended even to archaisms which were unknown to the Aeolians, such as the genitive endings -οιο, -αο, -αων, the dative plural -εσσι, the forms in -φι, the dual ὅσσε, the reduplicated aorist and future, verbal forms without a connecting vowel, etc. "Aeolic" with them was often equivalent to "archaic" and sometimes merely "unusual," as, for instance, forms in -της, θέμιστος, φάρυγος, ἀλκί, ἰῶκα, θύγατρα, the suffix -θεν, and the apocope of prepositions. The errors of the ancients on these points can often be detected from their own remarks. The grammarians, for instance, draw conclusions from false analogies, or they cite only Homeric examples, giving no Aeolic parallels. The statements ascribed to Herodian, whether the mistakes were his, or resulted from his being misunderstood, are little to be trusted. He is said, among other things, to have inferred from μάρτυρ that rhotacism (οὔτορ, ἵππορ, etc.) was Aeolic.

The mass of these false Aeolisms was greatly reduced by Hinrichs, in his dissertation *De Homericæ elocutionis vestigiis Aeolicis* (Jena 1875); but he left a considerable number which he explained as relics of pre-Homeric poetry of the Aeolians. The present article is the result of a study of the "Aeolisms" which Hinrichs has not explained away; and the conclusion arrived at is that in the language of Homer there are mixed together, not the dialects of different tribes, but the varieties of speech of one and the same tribe at different epochs.

First must be eliminated from the so-called Aeolisms all phenomena which, so far from deserving the name of Aeolisms, do not so much as occur in Aeolic. To begin with ὅ Διολκόν: it is true that the Aeolians often used ὅ for δ, but

the grammarians have greatly exaggerated the extent of this peculiarity. Ἐπασσύτεροι, ἄλλυδις, and ἄμυδις (in which *v* has nothing to do with the instrumental suffix of ἄμα), are not of Aeolic origin. This dialect never changes *o* into *v* except in *υ=οι* of the locative, which is not unknown to Doric, as shown by *νίς*. Only Arcadians and Pamphylians change the characteristic of *o*-stems into *υ*. But how did these forms get into Homer? Sengebusch would probably answer: "Here we have the Arcadians, the benefactors of Homer"; but we should bear in mind rather that the Pamphylians were descended from Achaeans. Besides, it may reasonably be suspected that ἄλλοδις and ἄμοδις are the true Homeric forms. As *-δης* was considered Aeolic, the grammarians may have changed the thematic vowel after the analogy of ἄλλυι, just as they Aeolized the breathing of ἄμυδις. In Ἐπασσύτεροι the *v* may be original as in τηλύγετος, αἰσυμένητης.

With regard to the masculine nominatives in *-α* (ἱπποτα, and the like), the grammarians were totally at a loss for an explanation. Inscriptions do not help to a solution (for all Boeotian parallels are doubtful). These forms may have been misunderstood vocatives.

When *F* preceded by another consonant begins a word, all Greeks sometimes prefixed *ē* as in ἐδφεῖκοσι. The Homeric poets, misled by words of this sort, which had lost the first consonant, placed *ē* before simple *F*. But Fick sees an Aeolism here, and thinks the original forms were *νείκοσι*, *νεδνα*, *νέλδωρ*, etc.; and yet the Aeolians never vocalized initial *F*. The apparent examples cited by Curtius, and Ὑέλη, are all aspirated and are not Aeolic words. In E 487 (which is corrupt), Hartel's conjecture *ὑάλλοντε* may be disregarded. Probably we should read *λίνιοι Φάλλοντε*.

Further, some "Aeolisms" are to be removed which are not critically authenticated. Neither the accent nor the breathing can prove anything. The accentuation is that of the Alexandrine period, as is shown by *ἑταῖροι*, *μέλισσαι*, etc. There could be no ancient tradition, because the accent did not make itself felt in the recitation of the hexameters. The breathing is still more uncertain. The Asiatic Ionians, like the Aeolians, appear to have dropped the aspirate, as is shown by the well-known peculiarities of Herodotus.

When the reading is doubtful the "Aeolisms" should be rejected. Ζαῆν, μ 313 is a needless invention. Κεκλήγοντες, and the like, for various reasons cannot be counted as Aeolisms. Present forms in the perfect are not restricted to Aeolic; and besides, the ancients themselves derived this from a second aorist; hence κεκλήγοντες in Cod. Harl., and πεπληγών, B 264 (cf. ἐπέπληγον, E 504). Ἀπειλήτην, λ 313, and δορπήτην, ο 302, are incredible.

Among the "Aeolisms" we find forms which were not unknown to Ionic; and even when Ionic examples are not found, but parallels occur in other dialects, we may plausibly assume that the absence of examples in Ionic is due to accident.

The change of thematic *o* to *v* has been discussed. The same change *within* the stem is not confined to Aeolic, and is sometimes found in Ionic, as Hipponax, frag. 132, ῥυφεῖν and frag. 4, 3, δυσώνυμος. Ἀμφιγνήεις has nothing to do with γόος, and ἐπισμυγερός and διαπρύσιος are of doubtful etymology. Ἀγυρις has its parallel in πανήγυρις, and πύματος (epic only) may be compared with πρύτανις. In πίσυρες *υ* is original, and the Aeolic is πέσυρες or πίσυρες. Still

the Aeolic numeral may have been introduced by commercial interchange into north Ionia just as the declined decades came from Aeolia to Chios. In *ἀμύμων* the *ῃ* comes, not from *ω*, but from *οF* direct.

It is usually assumed that *ο* representing *α* must be Aeolic; but *πόρδαλις* is not Hellenic, and was not regarded as an Aeolic word by the ancients.

There is no reason to regard *βέρεθρον* as Aeolic, for the form *βάραθρον* never occurs in Ionic. In Hdt. VII 33 it is an Attic proper name.

The prefix *ἐρι-* does not occur in the Lesbian poets. A citizen of Mitylene was called *Erigyios*; but then an Ionian of Styra calls himself *Ἐρικλέης* on a lead plate.

Such names as *Θερσίτης* have abundant parallels in proper names, although *θερσ-* otherwise became *θαρσ-* in Ionian and Attic of the historic period.

Semivocalic *F*, as in *ταλαύρινος*, *ἀπούρας*, etc., occurs also in prose, and besides we are at liberty to write *ταλάφρινος* or *ταλάρρινος*. Blass notes that *v* is often inserted by copyists.

It is doubtful whether *ζα-* is identical with *διά*. It is never local, but only serves to strengthen adjectives. It occurs once in Alcaeus (*ζάδηλος*, 18, 7), once in Sappho (*ζάβατος*, frag. 158), once in Hdt. (*ζάπλοντος*, I 32), and in *ζάκορος* (in the Attic and Ionic mysteries of Demeter). But granted that it is identical with *διά*: this became *ζά* only in late Aeolic. In Sappho, frag. 87, we should read *διὰ*, *i. e.* *δῖα*.

Even if the Aeolians substituted *φ* for *θ* (which is not certain), the *Φῆρες* of Homer is a proper name. If *φλίψεται*, a reading of Zenodotus followed by Theocritus (15, 76), is correct, still *φ* may be archaic (cf. *fligo*, Goth. *bliggvan*) and has analogies in Attic.

With *ἔμος*, *γέλος* compare Ionic *λαγός*, *κάλος*. So the "Aeolic" forms in *-is* are not confined to Aeolic. *Ἄγυρις* = *ἀγορά* occurs in Attic. For the *v* compare *ἀγύρτης*, *ἀγνυμα*.

When a form is found in Homer alone it is called archaic; but if it occurs also in Aeolic, then it is an "Aeolism." But why should it be assumed that such words did not belong to old Ionic too? The history of the digamma, now no longer "Aeolic," should be a warning.

We now take up *ᾱ*. It can be shown that the Homeric writers used *ᾱ* inconsistently with Ionic laws only in proper names (*Ἑρμείας*, *Αἰνείας*, *Διγείας*) and in *θεά*. These were all taken from older poems. In Homeric times *Ἑρμείας* was the current form; but metrical necessity led to the older form, or to synizesis. *Ἑρμῆς* should not be written in Homer. The last syllable of *Ναυσικάα* may have been lengthened *metri gratia*, or *ι* may have stood before *-α*, cf. *Ἀθηνάα*, CIA I, 351). *Θεή* was formed by the Alexandrians, and *θεῆς* was smuggled into the Hymn to Demeter, 183, 279, whereas *θεᾶ* stands in 210. The *av* of *Ναυσικάα* has analogies in Hdt., etc.

In other cases a genuine *ᾱ* does not occur at all. In all apparent instances that are genuine the *α* is mesochronous (*mittelzeitig*). For *ἄριστον*, Ω 124, π 2, we should read *ἄFέριστον*, like *ἄFέκοντε*; so *δαFελός* for *δαλός*, N 320. In Sophron occurs *δαελός*, and Hesychius has *δαβελός*, *δαλός* *Λάκωνες*. Instead of *ἄτη* Nauck has restored *ἄFάτη*; of the three places where this is impossible, two (Z 356 = Ω 28) should have *ἄρχῆς* with several MSS, and in the other (T 88) we may read *ἄFάτην φρεσὶν ἐμβαλὼν αἰνήν*. For *ἄρος*, whose *α* is always

in the thesis (*ἄρσις*), we should read *λιάρός*, as is shown by a comparison of P 572 with Δ 477. In place of *δανά*, ο 322, perhaps *δαννά* should be written. In Δ 433, *πολυπάμμονος* (for *πολυπατμνος*) is necessary and is supported by some MSS and by Hesychius. So Πάμμων, Ω 250, and ἀμμός. For *χαμᾶζε* write *χαμάζε* (cf. *χαμάδης*). Instead of *ἄλσο*, ἄλτο write *ἄλσο*, ἄλτο (*ἄλτο* often in Ven. A), or *ἤλσο*, *ἤλτο* (for the grammarians who changed the breathing may have changed the vowel also).

We now take up genuine cases of *a* with middle quantity. It is treated as a long vowel in the Homeric poems under the following conditions:

I. In the arsis (*θέσις*). 1. Before digamma and semivocalic *ι* (*ι*). (a) Before digamma: in *ἄφασάμην*, I 116, and in the words which are written in MSS as follows: *ἄσσαν*, *ἄσφ'*, *ἀείδει*, *ἄεσα*, *ἄεσαμεν*, *ἄήρ*, *ἄκραίε*, *ἄλμαες*, *δυσσᾶς*, etc. *Ἄιδος*, *αἴσσω*, *αἴζας*, etc., *ἄιον*, *ἄιε*, *ἄορι*, *χρυσάορος*, *τετράορος*, *βονυγίε*, *Ἰάνες*, *Ἰλαος* (cf. I 639, *Ἰλάος*), *λαός* and its compounds, *μεμαώς* and the like, *φᾶος* (in *φάεα καλά*). In *ἀγανός* and *αἰίαχοι* the diphthong is written. In *ἐκηα* η is written for *aF*, although *ἐχεFa* was written *ἐχενα*. It is probable that η or rather ηF actually replaced *aF* only when there was a succession of several short syllables, as in *ἡέλιος*, *ἡέριος*, etc. The Homeric composers probably said *ἐκαFa*. In the case of *eF* sometimes ην is written, sometimes η. For *oF* we find ω except in *δFιες* (Aristarch. *οἰες*). (b) Before semivocalic *ι*: in *δαίζων*,² Δ 497 (cf. H 247, *δαίζων*), and in the words written as follows: *ἐλάινος*, *ἐλαίνεος*, *ὀπάων*, *διδυμᾶνεος*, *Ἀλκμᾶων*, (ο 249 v. l. *Ἀλκμαίων*), *Ἀμοπάων*, *Ἀμυθᾶων*, *Ἀπισᾶων*, *Ἐλικᾶων*, *Ἰκετᾶων*, *Λυκάων*, *Μαχᾶων*, *Ἀμφιάρως*. In *ἀνάνοντα* the diphthong should be written. The genitive ending *-ao* forms the majority of examples. This ending was contracted into *-ω*; but the effect of *a* continued in the later Ionic *-εω*. No instance of *-ᾶjo* happens to occur; but we should probably read *Ἄλταο* in Φ 86 and *συβῶταο* in ο 304. It would seem proper, therefore, to remove *-εω* from Homer, except, possibly, from the later portions of the Odyssey. *Παῖών* is a euphonic modification of *Παῖάων*. Semivocalic *ι* has a similar effect on *ι* (the *ι* of *ἦμι*, for instance, varies in quantity). 2. Before a consonant which originally had *F* or *j* after it. (a) Digamma: *ἀνFεται* (*ἀννεται*), K 251, but *ἄνοιτο*, Σ 470. So *ἄδFεές* (cf. *ἀδείης*, H 117, changed by Ahrens), *ἄδFην*, *ἄδFήσειεν*. When the syllable is long the consonant should be written double. The ancients vacillated, and wrote *ξεῖνος* (*ξένFος*), *δουρί*, etc., but *ἐνννοσίγαιος*, *ἐννηφιν*, etc. (b) Semivocalic *ι*: *Fεανjός*, *κιχάνjω*, *καλjός*, which for a long time was *καλλός*, as in Alcman, frag. 98.

II. In the thesis a vowel before *F* or *j* is treated as being long only when the metrical form of the word renders this necessary, as in *Ποσειδάjων*, *διψάjων*.³ Here belong some assimilated forms, such as *ἡγάσθε*, *ἡβᾶοντα*. To avoid the succession of too many short syllables *aj* became η in *Ποσειδήμος*.⁴ The procedure with *ej*, *yj*, *oF*, *oj*, etc. was analogous to that with *aj*, *aF*. When the vowel was followed by another consonant and *F* or *j*, the consonant was doubled in Homeric times, so that the syllable is regularly long, as in *καλλός*, *φθάννει*, *ἀδῆγκότες*. We should also write *ικάννω*, *ἄννεται*, etc. (see above).

¹ *ἸάFων* does really begin to look like *Ἰαφαν*.

² *Δα(F)ήρ* is inserted here and compared with *δάήρ*, Ω 769; he must mean *δαίjήρ*.

³ In this and some other instances the metrical necessity is not absolute.

⁴ Why classed here?

Λαός (not counting derivatives) has \bar{a} 241 times in the arsis and only 29 times in the thesis. Some of these 29 examples may be removed by easy emendations.¹ Those in the late portions of the Iliad and the Odyssey need not be disturbed. Analogous irregularities affecting other vowels can be similarly removed: *θείη*, for instance, should be *θεFίη*, and *εἰώργει*, *ἐFeFόργει*. In Homeric days *F* between vowels was wellnigh intact.

When a word will not otherwise enter a hexameter, any vowel may be lengthened in the arsis. In this way \bar{a} sometimes originates: *ἀθάνατος*, *ἀπονέεσθαι*, etc. The ictus can lengthen, and when two long syllables follow, as *Ἀπόλλωνι*, or precede, as *Περσῆα*. But *before a liquid* \bar{a} is sometimes lengthened (without metrical necessity) in the arsis, never in the thesis, except in a few cases "readily emended."

Only a few sporadic cases remain. *Ἑαδότα*, *ἐάγη*, *ἄαγές*, *εἴασα*, *εἰάσω* can be old Ionic. In the last two η never occurs. *Ψαρών*, P 755, is an Atticism that has crept in (cf. *ψήρας*, II 583). *Μάν* originated in the following way: the ancients, misled by the usage of Herodotus, regarded *μέν* as the only Ionic form, so that when it had to be long they wrote the Doric and Aeolic *μάν* rather than the Attic and old Ionic *μήν*.

In *νύμφᾱ φίλη*, which has been called an Aeolism, we probably have an isolated instance of a feminine vocative formed after the analogy of the masculine. Whatever it be, it is not Aeolic. In Sappho, frag. 105, *νύμφα*, according to Bergk, stands at the end of the verse.

It has already been remarked that when a consonant was originally followed by *F* or *j*, the consonant was doubled in Homeric times. If, now, we take the development *ενF*, *ενν*, *ην*, *ειν*, the Homeric authors were at the second stage, but the *μεταχαρακτηρίζοντες* at the fourth. This latter became general in new Ionic, while Aeolic remained at the second stage. This, however, does not prove (as is sometimes assumed) that the old Ionic was not also at the second stage. This principle applies also to *σμ*, *σν*, *νσ*, in which the double consonant held its ground more firmly. Analogies are found in Attic, as *ἐνννμι*. In some words one of the consonants is dropped in Attic, as in *δόρατα*, which comes rather from *δόρρατα* than from *δούρατα*.

The way is now prepared for an attack upon the citadel of the Aeolisms,—the personal pronouns. All agree that *τοι*, *τείν τίννη*, *τέος*, *ἄμμός* are archaisms. May this not be true of those forms which are considered Aeolic? We must first, indeed, remove their Aeolic mask, and change *ἄμμες*, *ὑμμες* back into *ἄμμές* or *ἀμμές* (= *ἀσμές*) and *ὑμμές* (= *ὑσμές*), whence by suppression and compensation came *ἡμές ὕμές*, and by analogy *ἡμέες ἡμεῖς*, *ὕμέες ὕμεῖς*. A scrutiny of all the Homeric examples, with "a few emendations," yields the following results: (1) In the nominative *ἄμμές*, *ὕμμές* before a vowel, before a consonant *ἡμές*, *ὕμές*; later *ἡμέες*, *ὕμέες* (before a vowel). (2) In the genitive *ἡμέων*, *ὕμέων* (*metri gratia* sometimes — —). (3) In the dative *ἡμμί(ν)*, *ὕμμί(ν)* and *ἡμῖν*, *ὕμῖν* (all with short ultima); later *ἡμῖν*, *ὕμῖν*. (4) In the accusative *ἄμμέ*, *ὕμμέ*, probably old dual forms used as plurals, so certainly not Aeolic; later (or doubtful) *ἡμέας*, while *ὕμέας* does not occur at all.

[What gives us the right to pronounce a form or a word Ionic or non-

¹ These are given by Sittl. They imply, according to the laws of probabilities, that some twenty per cent. of the verses of Homer are corrupt.

Ionic? The text of Herodotus and that of Hippocrates are too uncertain, and the inscriptions are too few and also too recent to be used in questions relating to Homer. The old Ionic probably differed much from the new.]

But how about the very ancient heroic poems of the Aeolians, which are supposed to have had their influence upon the Homeric authors? They are fictions constructed out of the supposed Aeolisms of Homer. [The Aeolians emigrated from Boeotia. That their leader was represented as having been a descendant of Agamemnon, resulted from a desire to seem to have a right to the land occupied similar to that of the Dorians to Peloponnesus—the right growing out of the leadership of a Hero. The colonists themselves are spoken of only as Aeolians. The Trojan war cannot, therefore, relate to the Aeolian migration, even if we disregard chronological difficulties. The chieftains of the Iliad, on the contrary, stand in close relation to the Ionians, who would not have borrowed traditions from the Aeolians. Moreover, in an Aeolian epos Agamemnon would have been presented more favorably. No doubt there were pre-Homeric popular songs among the Lesbians; but these could not have influenced the Homeric poems to any considerable extent.]

[I have given the substance of this article without inserting any views of my own into the abstract. The author discusses at length several interesting questions and adds many references and foot-notes, which I have ignored, as those desiring to study the subject thoroughly will consult the original article. This article, and the discussion of this subject in the author's Greek Literature, have been reviewed by Gustav Hinrichs in a work entitled *Herr Dr. Karl Sittl und die homerischen Aeolismen* (Berlin, 1884), in which the other side of the question is presented ably though not courteously.]

II.

Pp. 32-78. The Dative Plural in Greek, by Ferdinand Weck. After some general remarks on movable *v*, the author proceeds to the dative plural, and announces the theory that *-σιν* is the suffix which appears in Latin in the form of *-im* (*-sim*), and that in both languages it is added to the *nominative plural*. Cf. *virī-tim*, *membra-tim*, *agmina-tim* (apparent exceptions are explained away); *δίκαι* (originally *δίκη*) *δίκησιν*, *λόγοι* *λόγοισιν*, *κήρυκες* *κήρύκεσιν*. In the course of time the *-v* was often dropped,¹ and in the first and second declensions the *ι* was finally suppressed. Neuter nouns of the *ο*-declension followed the analogy of the masculine, whence *δῶροισιν*, not *δῶρασιν*; but there are traces of the original *-ασιν*, as in *ἄσπρασι* (for so it was formerly accented, and still should be; *πατράσι* is a very different thing). *Δένδρεσι* is corrupted from *δένδρασι*, and *προσώπασι* is from *πρόσωπα*, not *προσώπατα*, the only example of which (*σ* 192) can readily be removed by writing *πρόσωπα τὰ*. Finally, *ἀνδραπόδεσι* is an error for *ἀνδραπόδασιν* with its *a* lengthened *metri gratia*. In the third declension the ending *-σι* could not be reduced to *-ς* (*κήρυκες*), but an abbreviation of another sort took place. In the case of vowel-stems the steps were as follows: *νέκυεσσι*, *νέκυῃσι*, *νέκυσι* (possible because the syllable is long by position), *νέκυσι*. For the consonant-stems the procedure was *πόδες-σι*, *ποδ(ε)σι*,

¹ It would seem natural here to assume that the original form was *-tim* as in Latin, and that final *m* was either changed into *v* or dropped.

ποσ-σαι, ποσσί, ποσί. This accounts for the absence of compensation, which would have to be made if -σι were added directly to the stem. [I have given the most general outline of the theory. The article contains discussions of many questions, such as the relation or want of relation of the Greek dative plural to the Skt. -ais, the origin of ἀνδράσιν (Svarabhakti), τοῖσδεσσιν (τοῖς δεσσίν, dat. of οἱ δεινέες, cf. χεῖρ χερσίν), providing for all the datives plural in the Iliad and the Odyssey, of which a complete list is given with verses indicated.]

III. Pp. 78-85. On the Aegidae, the reputed ancestors of Pindar, by L. Bornemann.

IV. Pp. 86-105. Contributions to the criticism and interpretation of Ennius, by Lucian Müller.

V. Pp. 106-136. Greek Manuscripts from Fayyûm (with a photo-lithograph), by Hugo Landwehr.

VI. P. 136. Note on Rhet. Lat. ed. Halm, p. 65, by A. Eussner.

VII. Pp. 137-194. Report of works bearing on the Scriptores Historiae Augustae for the years 1865-82, by Hermann Peter.

VIII. Pp. 195-207. Miscellaneous. 1. Supplement to article on Greek dative plural, by F. Weck. 2. On the Hymn to Apol. Del., by R. Peppmüller. 3. The number of zones according to Eratosthenes, by Max C. P. Schmidt. 4. On Cicero's Orations, by G. Landgraf. 5. On Quintil. Inst. Or. X 3, 25, by Ferd. Becher. 6. Pyrrhus and the Acarnanians, by C. G. Unger.

IX. P. 208. Extracts from journals, transactions of societies, etc.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. XXXVII
Band. 1883.

III Heft.

The study of modern Syriac, now being carried on with so much vigor, is hardly more than half a century old. Hoffmann, in 1827, denied the existence of spoken Syriac, against the testimony of Niebuhr. The first attempt to reduce it to writing was made in Urmia about fifty years ago; now we have the works of Socin, on the dialects spoken from Urmia to Mosul, of Prym and Socin on the dialect of Tūr 'Abdīn, of Duval on the dialects of Salamas, the modern Syriac grammars of Stoddard and Nöldeke, and in this number of the Zeitschrift, a paper by Professor Guidi, of Rome, on the Felliḥī dialect. This, which is spoken near Mosul and elsewhere by a population of over fifty thousand, he describes as being nearer to the language of Urmia than to that of Tūr. Zeḳāfā is *a*, *ā*, and not *o*; Pe is commonly *p* and not *f*; 'E (Ayin) is sounded like Alef, and *h* is frequent. It has the infin., which is used in the expression of the present, the verb has no object-suffixes, and the article, *u*, *i*, *an*, found in Tūr, is here wanting. In contrast with the Urmi, it retains many letters or syllables which have disappeared in the former; in pronominal, verbal and nominal inflections, and in syntax, the two dialects closely resemble each other. Guidi gives several long prose and poetical pieces of Felliḥī in Roman

transliteration. The material for his paper he obtained from Pater Audo and the student Manni, of the Propaganda, and he had the aid of Pater Riḥmānī, of Mosul.

D. H. Müller, of Vienna, publishes and explains the Sabean inscriptions recently discovered and collected by Siegfried Langer, whose brief career and tragic end he relates. After an uncommonly full and promising course of study and preparatory work, Langer left Vienna in June, 1881, for the East, going first to Syria, and thence to Hodaida, on the west coast of Arabia, not far north of Mocha, which he reached in February, 1882. Here he made an expedition into the interior to Ṣan'ā, and obtained several valuable inscriptions; an account of this journey he published in "Ausland," 1882, No. 39. After vexatious delays in Ṣan'ā, he was sent back to Ḥodaida by the governor, whence he sailed to Aden. From Aden he sent his inscriptions and reports to Europe, and, May 20, began a very dangerous journey to Yaśa-land, intending to go thence to Ḥaḍramaut. May 29 he wrote from El-Ḥautha, and June 19 the news of his murder was received in Aden. He was killed by his attendants for the sake of plunder—another costly victim to Arab cupidity! He was not quite twenty-five years old. The inscriptions collected by Langer, the most of them new, are taken from buildings and tombstones; in the former case they run according to an established formula: "A and B have built, levelled, and roofed this structure, with the aid of such and such gods, and such and such princes." Müller's commentary contains a rich mass of grammatical, geographical, historical, and theological observations. He finds that the Sabean dual ended in *ayn* in the absolute state, and *ay* in the construct, that the Minaean construct dual-ending *ay* could be added to the singular, and, what seems strange, in the demonstrative state could be added also to the demonstrative (p. 330). He discovers a trace of nom. plu. ending *un* in Sabean (p. 380), and discusses the formation of the nisbāt or relative adjectives (p. 334 f.). A Ḥaḍramautic inscription gives him occasion to discuss the character of this dialect and its relation to the Minaean (p. 392 ff.). The question of the use of *El* "god" as appellative he considers solved by the occurrence of the word in this sense in one of the inscriptions (p. 366). Several new deities make their appearance: a Ḥalam or Ḥalla, Raḥām, and a Baśar, of none of which names Müller ventures on a decided explanation; Šarkōn, he suggests, is a male god of the dawn; and of the numerous 'Aṭtars mentioned in the inscriptions he thinks that Aṭtar Šarkan occupies this peculiar position that, while no monuments are consecrated or sacrifices offered to him, he is the guardian of sanctuaries. It may be noted that as "Baal" is used in Sabaeen divine names just as in Phœnician, almost as a simple appellative "lord," so the "Aṭtar" is employed somewhat as the Assyrian "Ištar," which is also an appellative = "goddess." Müller gives a number of new names of kings which he has collected from various sources, of which eleven belong to the latest period of the history, the Sabaeo-Himyaritic. In an appendix, Dr. J. H. Mordtmann discusses the inscription of Naḵb'l-Ḥajr. There are added three indexes, of topics, of Sabaeen words, and of passages from other inscriptions here discussed.

Dr. Stickel communicates the legends of a talisman and a number of seals, Arabic, Persian and Turkish, now in the Royal Museum at Cassel. The chief

difficulty in deciphering the legends arises from the fact that the engraver, having usually to insert, besides the owner's name, some sentence or title or other matter, and it being hard to find room, scatters his syllables and letters over the surface as vacant spaces offer themselves. The inscriptions are usually prayers; the talisman has the names of the four angels, Gabriel, Michael, Azrael, Asrafel.

Nestle's question in Vol. 37 of the *Zeitschrift* (see the Report in this Journal, Vol. IV, No. 4) as to whence Jacob of Edessa got his derivation of *θεός* from *aíthev* is referred to by Dr. J. Löbe, who says that this etymology was known to G. J. Vossius, *Etymologicum linguae latinae*, Naples, 1762, I, p. 241. Vossius quotes from Festus that *deus* is derived from *θεός*, and then asks from what *θεός* comes, to which he answers that Johannes Damascenus thinks it is from *aíthev*, because God is said in the Scriptures to be a consuming fire. Löbe refers to Macrobius, who is cited by the editor of the Journal, along with Plato, in the number above-mentioned. Löbe adds that, according to the *Etymologicum Magnum*, *aíthev* is derived from *daíev*, thus: by metathesis *daíw* becomes *aíðw*, and this, by change of *ð* to *θ*, *aíθw*.

The Açoka-inscriptions are discussed by G. Bühler.

A. Erman describes an Egyptian statuette found at Adana in Cilicia, taken from the tomb of a lady in Egypt, and carried thence to Cilicia at some unknown time by some unknown chance.

A number of Tigrîña proverbs are communicated by Franz Praetorius.

E. Mayer, engineer in Posen, points out how the days of the week have been named after the several planets, namely, the 24 hours of the day were named after the seven planets, which would go round three times, with three over, so that, each day receiving the name of the planet of its first hour, the planet of any given day will be fourth in order from that of the preceding day, whence comes our order, Sun, Moon, Mars, etc., to which the editors of the *Zeitschrift* append a note from Professor W. R. Smith, Cambridge, England, showing that the explanation, though probably correct, is not new, having been stated by Bacon from Dio Cassius, 37, 18. [See my Justin Martyr, *Apol. I* 67.—B. L. G.]

W. Bacher gives some striking examples of how Heb. *k* used for the transcription of Arab. *kh* was confounded by David Kimchi and others with Arab. *k*.

Book Notices: There are favorable notices of Pavet de Courteille's "Mirâdj-Nâmeh," by H. Vambery, and of Zuckermann's edition of the *Tosefta*, by Immanuel Löw. Löw points out a number of errors in the sixth fasciculus (containing the letters Lâmed and Mîm) of Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*.

E. Kautzsch finishes his survey of Hebrew and Old Test. literature for 1881, and H. Ethé gives the modern Persian.

IV Heft.

In regard to the use of Aristotle's *Parva Naturalia* among the Arabians, M. Steinschneider concludes that the name of the Arabic translator cannot be determined, that the translation does not appear in the tenth century, but certainly existed in the eleventh, and that it was widely used.

Theodor Nöldeke, by the examination of a large number of stems, shows that verbs middle Jod exist in Hebrew, in accordance with the view of Schul-tens, Gesenius, Olshausen, Aug. Müller and others, and against that of Ewald, Stade and others.

Julius Euting gives translations of the Phenician inscription on the statue of Harpocrates in the Museum at Madrid, and one or two others, and of several Aramaic inscriptions.

The remarkable Palmyrene inscription of the time of Hadrian, containing a decree of the Senate of Palmyra respecting duties on imports and exports, was published, with translation and commentary, by Count de Vogüé in the *Journal Asiatique*, 8th Series, Vols. I and II. Ed. Sachau now points out its great linguistic value. The language in which it is written stands nearest of all Aramaean writings to the Biblical Aramaic. It has, for example, a number of passive forms (classic Syriac has entirely lost the passive), and such forms in Biblical Aramaic must therefore be regarded, not as a loan from Hebrew, for there is no reason to suppose Hebrew influence at Palmyra, but as a peculiarity of that Aramaic dialect of the first century which was spoken by Aramaeans in the West and by Jews in Palestine, the dialect consequently of Christ and his contemporaries.

Ernst Leumann gives text, with glossary, of two Kālaka-legends, to which he prefixes a discussion of the chronological questions involved.

Th. Aufrecht has a note on the Padyāmirtataranginī.

The remains of the Buddhistic Amarāvati Stūpe, collected by Dr. Burgess, contained inscriptions which were sent by him to Professor Bühler, by whom they were turned over to E. Hultzsch, and the latter now publishes them in transcription and with remarks. Most of them are also printed in Burgess's *Archaeological Survey*.

G. Bühler continues his investigation of the Açoka-inscriptions, following the works of Senart and Kern with critical additions.

Book Notices; W. Ahlwardt awards high praise to Dieterici's edition of the so-called Theology of Aristotle, a Neo-Platonic work, made under the influence of Plotinus. Duval's description of the modern Aramaic dialects of Salamās is said by Nöldeke to be a welcome addition to the work of Socin. H. Thorbecke highly commends Jahn's edition of Ibn Ya'īs's commentary on Zamach-šari's Mufaṣṣal, for which the German Oriental Society has supplied the funds. H. Jacobi describes the effort of the Bengalese Protap Chundra Roy to circulate the old Indian Epics. The fourth issue of the Mahābhārata has been printed, text and translation, an edition of the Rāmāyaṇa, and an English translation of the former. Those who wish to obtain copies of these works (for which no charge is made) may address Protap Chundra Roy, Datavya Bharat Karyala, Jorosanki, Calcutta.

XXXVIII Band. I Heft. 1884.

As a contribution to the explanation of the origin of the Jaini Çvetāmbara and Digambara sects (already partly treated by Lewis Rice in the *Indian*

Antiquary, Vol. 3), H. Jacobi gives text and translation of the legends contained in the *Vṛitti* to the *Uttarādhyayana Sutrā*, and text and full description of the *Bhadrabāhucarita* of Ratnanandin. Jacobi thinks it probable that the division of the Jina church into these sects was accomplished gradually—that under Bhadrabāhu, c. B. C. 350—a portion of the monks migrated to the south, and there adopted stricter ascetic rules of life; that the distinction between the northern and southern divisions of the church was developed some centuries later, about the beginning of our era; and that neither sect represents exactly the primitive Jaina life, each having grown in its own direction.

An important addition to the *Dictionnaire Kurde-Français*, par M. Auguste Jaba, edited in 1879 by Professor F. Justi, is made by General A. Houtum-Schindler, who has collected a number of Kurdish words not found in this dictionary, and gives besides paradigms and phrases. Professor Justi adds the references to his dictionary.

Chr. Bartholomae has a study of a number of *Gāthās*, giving transcribed text, translation, and grammatical and other remarks.

C. de Harlez remarks that the Persian tradition does not give the meaning "wisdom" (though Neriösegh so renders) to the Avestan word *mađa*, but rather (so the Pahlvi version) explains it by a term meaning "fermented liquors"; and the *Gāthā* word *mađa* is explained by the Persian translators by a word which seems to mean "magic."

R. Roth suggests that an effective way of determining the cradle of the Indo-European race, and thus settling the present controversy as to whether it was in Asia or in Europe, would be to discover the home of the Soma-plant, for where this plant grew, there the two Aryan peoples must have lived. He believes it possible to discover the plant, and has been in correspondence with the Russian botanist, Dr. Albert Regel, who has recently explored the regions of the upper Sir and Amu Darja, but without finding the Soma. Roth hopes that a thorough exploration of the Hindukush may yield valuable results, and that it will not require a botanist to find the plant.

J. Gildemeister rejects the Arabic derivation of the word "amulet," and thinks that, as it is an Old Latin word, mentioned by Varro (ap. Charisius 105, 9 Keil), and often used by Pliny, its origin must be sought in Latin sources.

In their *Sabäische Denkmäler*, p. 10, Mordtmann and Müller find mention of an Arabic votive offering of two golden camels, and Nöldeke reports a complete confirmation of this interpretation, sent him by Mordtmann, in the Puteoli Nabatean inscription (see the *Zeitschrift* XXIII, p. 150), which likewise has two camels offered to a deity.

Eilhard Wiedmann offers some corrective linguistic remarks on J. Baarman's essay on Ibn al Haitam's dissertation on light.

E. Reyer maintains that the old Egyptians had no iron tools, and imported their best bronze, and that in general the civilized peoples of pre-classical antiquity were not inventors of metallurgy, but were in this regard dependent on their less advanced neighbors. On this Professor W. Robertson Smith refers, *Zeitschrift* XXXVIII, p. 487, to Petrie's "Pyramids and Temples of

sion is very instructive, though in so obscure a subject much must remain doubtful; two important sources, the Assyrian and the Hamitic, are yet insufficiently worked up, and conclusions now reached must be held provisionally.

Other articles are: Explanations of various Iranian words, by Hübschmann. On the history of the Avesta-calendar, by Spiegel. Rigveda-Samhitā and Samavedārcika, with remarks on the analysis of the Rigveda hymns into smaller hymns and strophes, and on some related questions, by Oldenberg. Tigrīna proverbs, by Praetorius. Jaçna 36 as specimen of text and translation from the seven-part or thousand-syllable prayer of the Parsis.

In his notice of C. de Harlez's *De l'exégèse et de la correction des textes avestiques*, Leipzig, 1883, Spiegel, after remarking that the author's method of exegesis agrees in most cases with his own, declares that the conflict between the two existing methods of Avesta-interpretation is a struggle between philology and linguistics, and briefly states his objections to the second of these methods. The contrast is seen most prominently in the dictionary. The advocates of the linguistic method consider only what is against the tradition, and not what is for it. Secondly, in the linguistic comparisons only Sanskrit is used, and not the Iranian dialects, for example, modern Persian. And thirdly, this comparison of words is put not merely alongside of the tradition, but over it and against it. He adds some illustrations from the book under review.

C. H. TOY.

MNEMOSYNE.

Vol. XI, Part 4.

We have first in this part (pp. 337–50) a continuation of Herwerden's notes on the Republic of Plato. Very many of these are devoted to the detection and expulsion of *interpretamenta* and *emblemata*, and of the others there are not many of general interest. P. 371d: τοὺς δὲ πλάνητας ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐμπόρους (sc. καλοῦμεν). "Correcto accentu rescribatur πλάνητας, a voce πλάνης, qua in pedestri oratione veteres uti solent." P. 375e: ἄρ' οὖν σοι δοκεῖ ἐτι καὶ τοῦδε προσδεῖσθαι ὁ φυλακικὸς ἐσόμενος, πρὸς τῷ θυμοειδεῖ ἐτι προσγενέσθαι καὶ φιλόσοφος τὴν φύσιν. "Numquam verbum προσγίνεσθαι sic vidi usurpatum, ut significet *praeterea fieri*. Eo verbo si uti voluisset Plato, scripsisset τὸ πρὸς τῷ θ. ἐ. προσγενέσθαι καὶ τὸ φιλόσοφον τῇ φύσει. Sed scribere fortasse potuit, πρὸς τῷ θυμοειδεῖ προσέτι γενέσθαι καὶ φιλόσοφος τὴν φύσιν. Malim tamen: πρὸς τῷ θ. ἐ. ἐτι γενέσθαι deleta praepositione, quae facile adhaesit e praegressis." P. 391b: καὶ ὡς πρὸς τὸν ποταμὸν (Xanthum), θεὸν ὄντα, ἀπειθῶς εἶχε καὶ μάχεσθαι ἔτοιμος ἦν· καὶ αὐτὰς [τοῦ] ἐτέρου ποταμοῦ [Σπερχειοῦ] ἱερὰς τρίχας Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ, ἔφη, κόμην ὑπάσαιμι φέρεσθαι κτέ. "Absonum est prioris fluvii nomen omittentem posterioris apponere. Sed praeterea articulus delendus est, nam, si additur, nemo non de Simoente potius cogitabit quam de Sperchio. In sequentibus operae pretium est videre quam egregie Plato iudicavit Achilles Homericum indolem ei tribuens ἀνελθερίαν μετὰ φιλοχρηματίας καὶ αὐτὴν ὑπερφηανίαν θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Quanta sunt igitur verae poesis lenocinia, ut tamen Homerum legentes Achillem admiremur. Quippe nil est in illo caractere pusilli, sed aere, ut ita dicam, hominem poeta statuit et adamante, magnaue vitia ferocissimus heros magnis compensat virtutibus."

In pp. 351-73, Cobet continues, from volume X, his notes on Julian, ed. F. Hertlein, 1875-76. On p. 395a: τὴν ἑκατονταθῦσανον αἰγίδα τῷ Διὶ περιθεῖναι, he writes: "apud veteres et probatos scriptores numeralia πέντε, ἕξ, ὀκτώ et ἑκατόν in compositione non mutant formam. Dicebant πεντέπους, ἕξπους, ὀκτώπους et ἑκατόμπους, quibus sequiores substituebant πεντάπους, ἑξάπους, ὀκτάπους, et ἑκατοντάπους. Titubant igitur scribae qui in hac epistola dederunt ἑκατονταθῦσανον, ἑκατοντάχειρα, ἑκατοντακέφαλον, ἑκατονταπύλους, ἑκατονταπέδους, ἑκατοντακρήπιδας, ἑκατονταδόχους, ἑκατονταπλήθρους, pro ἑκατονθῦσανον, ἑκατόγχειρα, ἑκατογκέφαλον, ἑκατομπύλους cett. Aelius Dionysius apud Photium: πεντέπηχυν καὶ πεντέκλινον καὶ πεντέχαλκον καὶ πεντέμηνον καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅμοια οὕτω λέγονσι διὰ τοῦ Ε." On p. 414c, where he substitutes πολίχην for πολίχυνον, he writes: "Appellatur πολίχην *oppidulum* p. 340d civitas Parisiorum Lucetia: ἐτύγχανον χειμάζων περὶ τὴν φίλην Λουκετίαν ὀνομάζουσι δὲ οὕτως οἱ Κέλτοι τῶν Παρισίων τὴν πολίχην. ἐστὶ δὲ οὐ μὲν γὰρ νήσος ἐγκειμένη τῷ ποταμῷ καὶ αὐτὴν κύκλῳ πᾶσαν τείχος καταλαμβάνει (leg. περιλαμβάνει), ξίλιναι δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἀμφοτέρωθεν εἰσάγουσι γέφυραι. Quam sunt mutata tempora! ἡ τότε πολίχην νῦν γέγονεν ἐπιτομή τῆς οἰκουμένης, ut olim Roma." He loses no opportunity of reprobating Julian's superstition. On the "taediosa oratio εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Ἕλιον," he writes: "Sumsit has ineptias fanaticus princeps ab Iamblichō, ut ipse testatur p. 150d: 'Ἰάμβλιχος παρ' οὗ καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἐκ πολλῶν μικρὰ ἐλάβομεν. Hunc igitur praeceptorem suum Julianus, qui in nulla re modum servare solet, summis laudibus effert in coelum. Ad Sallustium scribens p. 157c ita dicit: *si vis τελεώτερα καὶ μυστικώτερα ἀνιδεῖν*, ἐντυχὼν τοῖς . . . Ἰαμβλίχου . . . συγγράμμασι τὸ τέλος ἐκείσε τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐρήσεως σοφίας. Ergo Iamblichus iudice Iuliano *ad summum sapientiae humanae fastigium pervenit*, Iamblichus, ὦ Μοῦσαι φίλαι! quem scimus omnes futilem nugatorem et impudentem impostorem fuisse. Lepidum est videre Julianum acceptis ab Iamblichō litteris laetitia gestientem, p. 437d: ὁσάκις μὲν τῷ στόματι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν προσήγαγον ὥσπερ αἱ μητέρες τὰ παῖδια προσπλέκονται, ὁσάκις δὲ ἐνέον τῶ στόματι καθάπερ ἐρωμένην ἑμαντοῦ φίλτάτην ἀσπαζόμενος, ὁσάκις δὲ τὴν ἐπιγραφήν αὐτήν, ἥ χειρὶ σὴ καθάπερ ἐναργεῖ σφραγίδι ἐσεσήμαντο, προσειπὼν καὶ φιλήσας εἰτα ἐπέβαλον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. Nec mirum: febris enim laborabat Julianus et accepta Iamblichī epistola statim febris decessit. Audi ipsum, p. 447a: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐλαβον εἰς χεῖρας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν μόνον . . . ἅμα τε ἐφυγον οἱ πόνοι καὶ με ὁ πυρετὸς ἀνῆκεν εὐθὺς. Apparet ex hac absurda epistola quam recte de Iuliano iudicet Ammianus Marcellinus, qui ex Iuliani aequalibus solus sapiebat, XXV 4: (erat Iulianus) *praesagiorum sciscitationi nimiae deditus . . . superstitiosus magis quam sacrorum legitimus observator*. Sanum et sobrium iudicium Ammiani, qui non erat Christianus, spectatur in iis, quae de Constantio scribit XXI 16: *Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem anili superstitione confundens; in qua scrutanda perplexius quam componenda gravius excitavit discidia plurima; quae progressa fusius aluit concertatione verborum: ut catervis antistitum iumentis publicis ultro citroque discurrentibus per synodos quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur arbitrium, rei vehiculariae succiderit nervos*. Quantum mutata illis temporibus religio Christiana fuerit ab ea quae olim absoluta et simplex fuisset, Ammianus declarat XXII 5: (Iulianus) *dissidentes Christianorum antistites cum plebe discissa in palatium intromissos monebat ut civilibus discordiis consopitis quisque nullo vetante religioni suae serviret intrepidus*. Praeclarum hoc quidem, sed erat haec Iuliani calliditas. Addit autem

Ammianus: *quod agebat adeo obstinate ut dissentiones augente licentia non timeret unanimitatem postea plebem* : NULLAS INFESTAS HOMINIBUS BESTIAS, UT SUNT SIBI FERALES PLERIQUE CHRISTIANORUM, EXPERTUS.

In pp. 374-86, C. M. Francken writes 'Ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos.' He begins by saying that 'Si Birtius de aetate librorum pergamenorū vere exposuit, corruunt ea quae de veneranda antiquitate codicum ante mille quingentos et amplius annos scriptorum Maius alique 'palaeographe' praedicare solebant; Birtius enim satis probabiliter disputat ante saeculum quartum vel quintum sola volumina papyracea, non item libros pergamenos, usurpata esse. Constat aetatem codicum, qui saeculum sextum superent, certo et accurate non posse definiri . . . fieri enim posse, ut librarii calligraphi antiquas litterarum formas studio expresserint, id quod ad Vergilii Palatinum et Romanum potissimum pertineat.' F.'s business in this article is to emend portions of the *oratio pro Scauro*, which, happily, occur alike in the Turin palimpsest, published, in 1824, by Peyron, and the Ambrosian, edited by Mai. Only the shortest of these notes can be quoted as a specimen. §40, "Scribendum: 'pateat hoc perfugium vero dolori, pateat iustis querellis, coniurationi via intercludatur, obsequiatur (A: *obsediatur*) insidiis' pro 'pateat vero h. p. dolori.' In *obsediatur* pro *obsequiatur* D et P confunduntur, quod genus corruptelae cadit tantum in scripturam q. d. capitalem. *Via* retineo etsi impugnatum a Madvigio cum Wolffio legente: *coniurationi int.*; nam Ambr. habet CONIURA | TIOVIINTERCLU; *u* et *v* in hoc genere codicum non ita facile confunduntur."

We have next (pp. 387-410) an "Epistula Critica ad Allardum Piersonum de Iuliano," by S. A. Naber. He says that he and his friend agreed, in the winter of 1882-83, to read together the letters of Julian; and now "in dulci otio feriarum Paschaliū," he has reduced to order the notes he made; and he hopes that the form in which he issues them "alii sic interpretentur, si quid boni afferre potuerim, Tuum id esse, qui vel ipse inveneris vel docte dubitando auctor mihi fueris ut investigarem quae pertinaci cura indagari posse viderentur. Meum autem id omne erit, in quo a vero aberravero. Nec certe Te in communionem meorum *παροραμάτων* assumere volui, sed cum Te palam alloquor et coram Musarum matre, apud omnes qui haec legent, profiteri mihi videor quanti Te faciam, cuius singulares animi ingenique dotes statim suspicere coepi, postquam fors nos una in hanc almam Musarum sedem detulit, ubi post varios casus et tot discrimina rerum, quae uterque nostrum expertus est, lassis maris viaeque tandem ab illis malis otium conceditur." The former portion of this article is devoted chiefly to the determination of the probable dates of the letters, the earliest of them being No. 53, 'Ad Iamblichum.' Naber makes no sarcastic remarks on the reverence of Julian for this man. "Hunc philosophum quanti Imperator fecerit, ubique apparet. Hic est ὁ δαίμονιος Ἰάμβλιχος, qui eum τὰ περὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐμίσησεν," and of whom "profitetur se sequi νέα ἰχνη ἀνδρός, ὃν μετὰ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐξ ἰσῆς Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ Πλάτῳ ἀγαπαὶ τε τίθηπέ τε." The ecstatic passage which Cobet quotes is cited also here. The letter which excited such enthusiasm was the reply of Iamblichus to one in which Julian described the difficulties of his journey from Milan to Nicomedia, ἐτι δὲ χεϊμώνων ὑπερβολὰς καὶ νόσων κινδύνους καὶ τὰς ἐκ Παννονίας τῆς ἄνω μετὰ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Καλχηδόνιον πορθμὸν διάπλου

μυρίας δὴ καὶ πολυτρόπους συμφοράς. There are many interesting remarks in this part of the paper in regard to Julian's decree, by which, as Gibbon says, 'the Christians were *directly* forbidden to teach; they were *indirectly* forbidden to learn; since they would not frequent the schools of the Pagans'; of George, of Cappadocia, "Episcopum Arianum et nequam, in cuius tutela hodie Anglia est," and of Athanasius. But the whole is rather confused, perhaps unavoidably. The latter part of the paper contains conjectural emendations of the text, of which some are very probable. "In edicto 42 Imperator Christianos rhetores et sophistas comparat cum perfidis cauponibus οἱ μάλιστα παιδεύουσιν ὅσα μάλιστα φαῦλα νομίζουσιν. Itane παιδεύουσιν? Equidem intelligam: ἐπαινοῦσιν. *Laudat* venales qui vult extrudere merces." "Meministine, mi Pier-sone, quum legebamus Epist. 57? Scribit Julianus ad Elpidium: τῇ μὲν τοῦ γράμματος βραχύτητι συγγνώμην νέμε, τοῖς ἰσοῖς δὲ ἡμᾶς ἀμείβεσθαι μὴ κατόκνει. Nemo pro brevi epistula brevem epistolam postulat, sed rogare solemus ut amicus dummodo possit cumulate gratiam rependat. Etiam Julianus contentus erit, si Elpidius tribus verbis rescripserit, sed literae quo longiores eo gratiores erunt . . . Itaque satis apud nos constabat corruptum esse τοῖς ἰσοῖς, et quae-rebamus remedium. Tum Tu, Quin legimus, inquis, τοῖς σοῖς δὲ ἀμείβεσθαι μὴ κατόκνει. Atavus tuus non melius collimasset." "Meministi Imperator se olim cum Themistio una Athenis fuisse, p. 253' b: τῶν Ἀττικῶν διηγημάτων ἡδέως ἐμνημήνην, sed διηγήματα fabellae sunt et recordabatur Ἀττικῶν διαιτημάτων." The conjecture of ἐμ' ἐωράκει for ἐπεπράχει, p. 273 a, and of ὑπογαίους καμίνους for ὑπὸ ταῖς καμίνους, p. 341 c, seem very happy.

Pp. 411-420 contain notes by J. J. Cornelissen on Halm's edition of Velleius Paterculus. Some thirty passages are commented on and corrected with greater or less probability. The first note is on i. 11, 6, where it is said that among other elements of felicity Metellus enjoyed *principale in republica fastigium extentumque vitae spatium et acres innocentesque pro republica cum inimicis contentiones*: "fieri non potest, ut Velleius contentiones, a Metello pro republica habitas, uno tenore acres appellarit et innocentes, quorum nominum alterum reprehensionem, laudem alterum continet. Ideo autem beatum Metellum praedicavit quod religioso animo et integro cum adversariis contendisset; quam ob rem corrigendum est *s a n c t a s innocentesque*, quibus utrisque adiectivis quae ad hominis naturam et ingenium proprie pertinent, usitato more in rem ab eo peractam transferuntur." The following is more probable: 24, 3. *Sulla compositis transmarinis rebus, cum ad eum . . . legati Parthorum venissent et in iis quidam magi ex notis corporis respondissent caelestem eius vitam et memoriam futuram . . .* "inapte scriptum est Sullae vitam caelestem futuram. Vera et genuina lectio est *caelestem et divinam eius memoriam futuram*. Cf. Cic. Phil. v. 28: illas caelestes divinasque legiones comprobastis; ibid. xii. 8, ipsa illa Martia, caelestis et divina legio."

Cobet next gives some notes (pp. 421-432), *de locis nonnullis apud Porphyrium περί ἀποχῆς τῶν ἐμφύχων* P. 15. *Ζημίας ἔταξαν οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦτο συνΕΙΔΟΤΕΣ* "Reiskius, quo, nemo est in indagandis et corrigendis librorum mendis perspicacior, in re grammatica, ut saepe vidimus, plumbeus est. Optime sciebat *perspicere* Graece dici *συννοῶν*, sed serio credebat '*consuesse veteres συνειδώς pro συνιδών usurpare.*' Noli credere, sed restitue *συνΕΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ*. Perfrequens in libris

MSS haec confusio." P. 35. ὑπό τε ὀφείων καταλήψεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ καὶ πετεινῶν. "Nemo bonus et probatus scriptor καταλήψεται passivo sensu accipit, ut sit *occupabitur*, non *occupabit*. Est in usu futuri *passivi* forma brevior *τιμήσομαι*, *ξητήσομαι*, *ξημιώσομαι*, *ὠφελήσομαι*, in quibus verbis forma eadem non habet *activam* notionem. 'Ακουσθήσομαι igitur dicendum, non ἀκούσομαι, quoniam ἀκούσομαι est *audiam*. Eadem de causa ἀφαιρεθήσομαι dicebant, non ἀφαιρήσομαι, et γελασθήσομαι non γελάσομαι, et καταληφθήσομαι non καταλήψομαι. In talibus veteres non peccant, sed veterum sero nati imitatores etiam in his impingere solent." One long note is on Porphyry's fondness for etymology: "saepe videbis Porphyrium etymologiae morbo et insania laborare, et quidquid in buccam venerit pro certo ponere . . . δρακεῖν igitur neque βλέπειν significat et multo minus ὅξυν βλέπειν, et nihil interest inter δρακεῖν et ἰδεῖν, quamobrem alia quaerenda est etymologia, quam indagabunt alii, namque equidem omnem hanc venationem esse arbitror μόχθον περισσὸν κοφόνον τ' εὐηθίαν."

Pp. 433-448 contain notes by Cobet *de locis quibusdam in Aeliani Varia Historia*. He begins: aut incredibilis inscitia aut turpissima adulatione Philostrati fuit qui . . . de Aeliano haec sustinuit scribere: Αἰλιανὸς Ῥωμαῖος μὲν ἦν, ἡγτίκυζε δὲ ὧσπερ οἱ ἐν τῇ μεσογείᾳ Ἀθηναῖοι . . . Nihil est Atticae dialecto dissimilius quam Aeliani oratio, indigesta farrago ex verbis et locutionibus modo Homericis, modo Tragicis, modo Atticis, modo Ionicis, modo vulgaribus et e trivio sumtis consarcinata . . . Aelianus ipse credebat se admirabili oratione ac stilo uti, sed quia non omnes ea admirabantur ita se consolatus est ut diceret sua scripta non nisi *eruditis auribus* placere posse . . . Aeliani sermo utpote omni genere ornamentorum distinctus ab ipso dicebatur ἢ Ἀσυνήθης λέξις, id est θαυμασὴ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὴς quemadmodum τὸ ἀσυνήθες est μικροπρεπὲς καὶ ἀθύνιαστον καὶ ἐνκαταφρόνητον." Many illustrations of all this are given. i 21. δόξαν μὲν ἀπέστειλε τῷ Πέρσῃ προσκυνήσεως. "Boni scriptores pro *adorantis speciem praeber*e dicebant προσκυνῶντος δόξαν παρέχειν, sed Aeliano, qui *ἀσυνήθης* sectatur, suus error relinquendus est." ii 11: μή τί σοι μεταμέλει ὅτι μέγα καὶ σεμνὸν οὐδὲν ἐγενόμεθα ἐν τῷ βίῳ; "Latinum est, non Graecum; *num quid te poenitet?* Graece eo sensu usurpatur μέμψεσθαι." iii 3: πάλιν ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἐπέθηκε τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν στέφανον. Bis ὁ ἀπτικίζων erravit: qui *coronam imponit capiti alterius* dicitur στέφανον ΠΕΡΙτιθέναι τινα, qui *suo στέφανον περιτιθεσθαι*. In his Graeci numquam peccant, Graeculi semper." iii 40: ἔσχον δὲ τὸ ὄνομα (οἱ Τίτυροι) ἐκ τῶν τερετισμάτων, οἷς χαίρουσι, Σάτυροι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ σεσηρέναι, Σιλίηροι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ σιλλαινέιν. "Satis ferax est nostra aetas etymologiarum, quae nec coelum nec terram tangunt, sed nemo in hoc genere stoliditatis palmam Graeculis praeripit. Quid est absurdius quam Τίτυροι ἐκ τῶν τερετισμάτων?"

This part ends with a note by Mr. Postgate on Sall. Jug. 53, 4, in which he proposes to emend 'at Romani quamquam itinere atque opere castrorum et proelio fessi LAETIQUE ERANT,' which the best MSS give, by reading *fessi, laeti quierant*.

C. D. MORRIS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, XXXVII 3.

i. pp. 321-42. F. Bücheler. Coniectanea. A series of condensed paragraphs. The first treats of Scribonius Largus, to whom the further name of Designatianus is sometimes falsely given, especially of his relations to Callistus, the freedman

and secretary of Claudius Caesar. Scribonius was, perhaps, of Sicilian birth, was a pupil of the younger Trypho, and his book was published in the year 47 or 48. The second note treats a couple of epigrams by Sophronius of Damascus, Archbishop of Jerusalem, who died A. D. 638. In a third note B. retracts the view expressed NRM. XXXV, p. 69, touching the date of Martyrius, author of the tract "de B et V," in the seventh volume of Keil's *Gramm. Latini*. This Martyrius quotes a certain Memnonius, *omnis hominem facundiae iudicem*; and probably Memnonius is no other than the father of Agathias (Anth. Pal. VII 552). Martyrius, then, is a writer of the sixth century. The next paragraph restores the record of a terrible earthquake by which the town of Tralles was destroyed, a. u. c. 727. Augustus was called upon for aid and gave it freely. The event seems to have made a great impression upon Horace. See Carm. III 3, 7, and I 34. The fifth group of notes deals with Phaedrus; the sixth with Columella and his kinsman Moderatus, the Pythagorean philosopher. In the seventh the Greek inscription quoted by Pliny (H. N. VII 210), is restored thus:

Ναυσικράτης ἀνέθετο τῇ Διὶς κόρη.
ἣ δ' Ἐργάνῃ δέξατο δωδόμενον τόδε.

In the eighth paragraph B. gives his readings of the Greek verses quoted in the metrical epitome of Marius Plotius Sacerdos. Finally he discusses a joke in the accounts of the Delphian priests. An inscription, of about 180 B. C., records among the temple records a *φιάλη καρνωτή*. The same vessel is recorded later, about A. D. 300, as a *φιάλη ἐκτυπα ἔχουσα Περσῶν πρόσωπα*, a strange discrepancy, to be thus explained. The *καρῖα* was a kind of nut-tree introduced into Greece from Persia and sometimes called *Περσική*. At some time a priest or a scribe, ignorant of this sort of nuts, hearing or reading of the vessel as *ἔχουσαν Περσικά*, amplified the *Περσικά* into *Περσῶν πρόσωπα*. These same nuts were called *βασιλικά*. The verses quoted by Macrobius Sat. III 18, 12, are to be corrected as follows: *admiscet bacam: βασιλέως haec nomine partim, partim Persica, quod nomen fit denique, fertur propterea.*

2. pp. 343-54. P. J. Meier. The Arrangement of Figures in the Representations of Single Combat on the Older Greek Vases. A discussion of archaeological details.

3. pp. 355-72. Th. Bergk. The Chronology of Artaxerxes Ochus. Communicated by A. Schaefer. A discussion of the disputed dates of this difficult period. Of the three fragmentary Athenian inscriptions relating to Orontes (CIA, II 108), B. thinks that those designated by Köhler as B and C indicate a state of political relations quite different from that of the year to which A belongs (Ol. 107, 3). He fixes upon Ol. 104, 4, as the date of B. Of a good deal of interest is the view taken of an episode in the life of Aristotle. It is well known that after the downfall of Hermeias, Aristotle took refuge in Lesbos. B. thinks that his stay there was short; that he soon went to Athens and began lectures on rhetoric and other subjects; that it was the reputation thus acquired in Athens which led Philip to select Aristotle as tutor for the young Alexander; that Isocrates was unpleasantly affected by this rivalry of a younger man, and gave vent to his feeling, though without naming names, in Panath. §§ 16-34.

4. pp 373-96. W. Deecke. Notes on the Interpretation of the Messapian Inscriptions. Continued from XXXVI 576 ff. In this number forms of the genitive case are examined.

5. pp. 397-416. A. Kalkmann. On the *ἐκφράσεις* of the elder Philostratos. It has been proved that Philostratos, in his descriptions, often followed the earlier poets. But he did not confine himself to materials upon which the poets had worked. K.'s analysis reveals extensive use of various sorts of learned literature. Is it then to be assumed that the painters, whose pictures Philostratos assumes to describe, went in search of subjects to those same various sorts of literature? That is highly improbable. "It is incredible that the sophist trusted his powers of invention so little as to confine himself to existing pictures, as incredible as that he would, had he attempted a collection of love-letters, have based the work on existing letters. He must have known very well how much harder it is to describe pictures than to imagine them, especially if he were disposed to make the latter operation easy by borrowing from many books." Such correspondences with actual works of art as may occur prove only what might be assumed without proof, viz. that Philostratos used his reminiscences of such works as freely as he used whatever else he found useful, much as a rhetorician, in composing *controversiae*, might use his recollections of actual cases in the courts. The story of the gallery at Naples is all a fiction of the study, an invention of the rhetorical fancy. But in publishing such inventions, Philostratos only followed the well-understood custom of his time: so far was he from any intention to deceive that he omitted to invent painters' names and other like details.

6. pp. 417-24. O. Ribbeck. Marginalia to the Truculentus. A series of peculiarly taking corrections. R. begins by remarking that in a text so sadly out of order as that of the Truculentus, too much must not be expected from minute study of the letters; that the thought, the grammar, the metre, often furnish the only possible clew to the reading. But still there are indications in the MSS of genuine readings which Schoell (the general character of whose work is praised) has passed over. R. writes in 172, *tam enim optumust amicis*. In 313, *iam quidem enim hercle ibo*. And in 733 he does not like to give up the repeated *enim*, in which the MSS agree. The case of 300 is peculiar: here the *hominem* of the Palatini is a corruption of *enim*, and the *homo* of the Ambrosianus is a correction of *hominem*. In all these, and many other cases, *enim* is a particle which demands the assent of the person addressed—an 'of course,' or a 'you know.' In 257 R. writes, *numne ego videor tu tibi?* In 266, *quia enim trucu (i. e. truncum) me lentum nominas*. In 330 (this time acting upon the supposition of deeper corruptions), *properet, tandem satis ut laverit*. In 363 *velim, si possit*. DIN. *puere, soleas cedo mihi*. In 521, *celebrandam ob rem*. In 565, *misere pessus it, regarding perit* as a gloss. In 583, *lubet auferri intro huc, mi Cuame*. In 584, *equid auditis? haec facite quae imperat*, the rhythm being necessarily Cretic. In 890, *sicin eum ipsa adire cupis? at recta ad nos (or med) itiner tenet*. In 926, *mortuam hercle medi satiust*. The restoration of 939-40 is at once peculiarly ingenious and peculiarly convincing: *verum nunc saltem a labro, si amas, dan tu mihi de tuis deliciis psomi aliquid pausillulum?* PHR. *Quid id ita a labrost quod dem dic*. In 951, *age prior πεπω τι*. In 958, the *cum* of the MSS only needs to be changed to *tum*, and in the following verse the

proper remedy is to supply missing words thus: *ego posterior? tantum qui dedi?* R. agrees with Schöll (and Bücheler) in bracketing 280-90, but thinks the interpolation extends through 294. This group of verses falls into three parts: 280-85 were designed for insertion after 269; 286-90 and 291-94 are both abbreviations of the passage following 268. It must be inferred from the name of the play that the role of the Truculentus had more importance than appears from our texts. But even in dealing with our texts we must see that something is wrong with the beginning of Act III, Sc. 2. Stratu-lax would hardly declare as he does (672-73), the change that has come over him, had not Phronesium in some way reminded him of his earlier behavior. Such a reminder may be found in 675, where *tuam exspecto, rus, truculentiam* should be read. The order of the verses will be 672, 675, 673, 674, 676. Another transposition is proposed in the final scene, as follows: 929, 935-38, 933, 934, 930-32, 939. And 937 belongs to Strabax, not Stratophanes.

7. pp. 425-33. L. Jeep. A Determination of the Period at which Zosimos lived. The time fixed upon is the beginning of the fifth century, the date of death about 425.

8. pp. 434-47. A. Ludwich. Notes on the Homeric Allegories of Herakleitos. Several pages are given to the important various readings of an Oxford MS, No. 298, of the Library of New College. This MS has supplied the means of correcting the text of a number of fragments of Greek poets. Archil. fr. 54 is quoted with the words *ἀκρα γυραί ὀρθόν*. The true reading is doubtless *Ἰνραι*. Archil. fr. 136 is quoted in the form *φῦμα μηρῶν μεταξὺν*, not *μηρίων*. Alkaios fr. 19 begins τὸ δ' αὖτε κῦμα τῷ προτέρῳ νόμῳ στείχει, a text which seems only to need an infinitesimal correction, thus: τῷ προτέρῳ νόμῳ. Alkaios fr. 79, *κάπιπλέυσαις*. Pind. fr. 245 (Bergk), *πρόβασιν βληχροῦ γίνεσθαι νείκεος*, not *γίνεται*. Sophokles fr. 359 (Nauck), the MS has *κεκλημένην*, the subscript iota being here, as elsewhere, omitted. A few other points treated in this paper seem too minute for a report.

9. pp. 448-64. L. Holzapfel. The Athenian Treatment of Mytilene after the Revolt of 428-7. Müller-Strübing, in his Studies of Thucydides, argued that the story of the execution of more than a thousand leaders in the revolt at Mytilene (Thuc. III 50) could not possibly be true; that the little parenthetical statement of the number in that passage must be an interpolation inserted by some "bloodthirsty grammarian." In a review of Müller-Strübing's book, H. Schütz has proposed to avoid the difficulties by assuming that the number given in the text of Thucydides is due to a corruption of Λ' into Ἀ. Holzapfel treats Müller-Strübing with great respect, but attempts a detailed refutation of both the views stated. Müller-Strübing lays great stress upon the fact that this wholesale butchery is not mentioned anywhere in ancient literature save in the one passage of Thucydides, although it is easy to find many passages in which much is made of Athenian cruelty, and the striking instances—all or nearly all less striking than this—are quoted. This argument, in H.'s view, loses all its force, if we examine the speech of Gylippos at Syracuse, during the discussion about the treatment of the Athenian prisoners, reported by Diodoros, XIII 30, 4 ff. In the report of this speech it is very probable that Diodoros borrowed from Ephoros. The words *ἐψηφίσαντο τοὺς*

ἐν τῇ πόλει κατασφάζαι may be an abridgment of something like Μυτιληναίων οὓς εἶχον ἐν τῇ πόλει αἰχμαλώτους ἐψηφίσαντο κατασφάζαι in Ephoros. But why is it not at least quite as probable that the words τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει point to a distinction made in the original Athenian decree between those concerned in or connected with the defence of Mytilene on the one hand, and the outside Lesbians who had kept clear of the revolt on the other? In general I cannot think that H. succeeds in seriously diminishing the very great force of Müller-Strübing's argument. It must be remembered that Gylippos was making an appeal to the ignorance and prejudice and passion of a multitude remote from Athens; that he speaks of an event long past; and that his statement, as it stands in Diodoros, is literally true. That he concealed an important part of the truth is not surprising: to say things precisely true so far as the letter goes with the deliberate intention of producing an impression flatly and entirely false, is a trick not even yet entirely disused by those who have occasion to delude the uninstructed. H. discusses the history of the whole transaction, and all his views and remarks certainly deserve careful consideration.

10. pp. 465-84. Miscellany. E. Rohde adds a note to his paper on the Sardinian Sleepers, XXXV 157 ff., reported in this Journal, II 123. K. Fuhr communicates certain facts hitherto unnoticed, touching the stichometric marks in the Cod. Urbinas of Isocrates. J. Baunack writes of glosses in Hesychios, which are of linguistic importance, and of the formation of Greek proper names. Under the first head he examines particularly the thematic forms of εἶμι as they occur in Byzantine dictionaries and in the inscriptions. He collects the following, which belong to two different forms of the root: Pres. ind. act. εἶω, ἰω; εἰσίεις; ἀπίει, προσίει, ἀνίει, ὑπεξίει, ὑπαπίει; εἰσίουσιν. Pres. mid. προίομαι; ἱεται δύνεται; ἰοίτο. Imperative, ἱε, εἰ, ἀπει. Imperf. act. ἦον; ἦε, ἦμε; ἦομεν; εἶεν, κατεῖεν; εἰ; ἰον, ἱε, ἰον. Imperf. mid. ἐνείτο, εἰσίοντο. The gloss ἀνιγρον· ἀκάθαρτον furnishes a desired instance of the preservation of the guttural in the root of νίζω. The note on proper names begins with a discussion of Δημήτηρ. This was explained (exceptionally) in antiquity as a short form of Δημομήτηρ. B. adopts and defends the explanation. This kind of shortening he calls "syllabic hyphaeresis," and gives numerous instances of it in other proper names, and also instances of various other usual modes of shortening. H. Usener calls attention to the date of the closing of the imperial gladiatorial schools as given in ecclesiastical chronicles found at Benevento and at Cologne. The date is A. D. 399. Gladiators, of course, still continued to exist for a time, and gladiatorial games were not stopped until several years later. R. Foerster gives two or three pages of "acta philologica et archaeologica." Th. Aufrecht discusses briefly the etymology of *ornare*. The notion of adornment is no more original here than in κοσμεῖν. How any one should ever have thought of connecting it with Skt. varṇa, which means *color*, and nothing else, is hard to see. The primitive meaning of the verb is *equip, fully arrange*; and the root is the same as that of ἀρπίζειν, ἀρτίνειν, and Lat. *ars, artus, armus*.

J. H. WHEELER.